

**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Marin County

Environmental Coordination and Review

Pursuant to Section 21000 et. seq. of the Public Resources Code and Marin County Environmental Impact Review Guidelines and Procedures, a Mitigated Negative Declaration is hereby granted for the following project.

- 1. Project Name: Saban Variance and Design Review
- 2. Location and Description: 100 Lagunitas Road, Lagunitas, California

Assessor's Parcel 170-091-17

Israel Saban proposes to complete the demolition of a pre-existing 870-square foot residence (of which all but 265 square feet has already been demolished) and construct a new residence on the vacant lot. The total proposed building area would be 1,429 square feet, consisting of 941 square feet of floor area and a 488 square foot garage. The proposal also includes 46 square feet of covered porches. The proposed project would result in a floor area ratio of approximately 5 percent on the 17,890 square foot lot. The proposed residence would reach a maximum height of 22 feet above surrounding grade and the exterior walls would have the following minimum setbacks: 20 feet from the top of the stream bank; 62 feet from the eastern front property line; 66 feet from the northern side property line; 26 feet from the southern side property line; and 8 feet 3 inches from the western rear property line. Various site improvements are also proposed, including a vehicle bridge and a footbridge across the stream, a new septic system, a six foot high fence in the front yard, low retaining walls, a parking area made of pervious pavers, and landscaping. The subject property is located at 100 Lagunitas Road, Lagunitas, CA, and is also identified as Assessor's Parcel 170-091-17.

- 3. Project Sponsor: Israel Saban

- 4. Finding:

Based on the attached Initial Study and without a public hearing, it is my judgment that:

- The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
- The significant effects of the project noted in the Initial Study attached have been mitigated by modifications to the project so that the potential adverse effects are reduced to a point where no significant effects would occur.

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Planning Manager

Based on the attached Initial Study, a Mitigated Negative Declaration is granted.

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Chairperson, Planning Commission

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Hearing Officer

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 President, Board of Supervisors

1. Mitigation Measures:

- No potential adverse impacts were identified, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.
- Please refer to mitigation measures in the attached Initial Study.
- The potential adverse impacts have been found to be mitigable as noted under the following factors in the Initial Study attached.

All of the mitigation measures for the above effects have been incorporated into the project and are embodied in conditions of approval recommended by the Marin County Community Development Agency- Planning Division. Other conditions of approval in support of these measures may also be advanced.

2. Preparation:

This Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared by Jeremy Tejjirian, Planning Manager of the Marin County Community Development Agency - Planning Division. Copies may be obtained at the address listed below.

Marin County Community Development Agency  
Planning Division  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308  
San Rafael, CA 94903  
(415) 473-6269  
Monday - Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

**MARIN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
PLANNING DIVISION**

**INITIAL STUDY**

***SABAN VARIANCE AND DESIGN REVIEW***

**I. BACKGROUND**

- A. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Israel Saban  
37064 Holly Street  
Fremont, CA 94536
- B. Lead Agency Name and Address:** Marin County Community Development  
Agency Planning Division,  
3501 Civic Center Dr., Suite 308  
San Rafael, CA 94903
- C. Agency Contact:** Jeremy Tejirian  
(415) 473-3798  
[jtejirian@marincounty.org](mailto:jtejirian@marincounty.org)

**II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

- A. Project Title:** Saban Variance and Design Review  
(Project ID 2011-0154)
- B. Type of Application(s):** Variance and Design Review
- C. Project Location:** 100 Lagunitas Road, Lagunitas, California  
Assessor's Parcel 170-091-17
- D. General Plan Designation:** SF4 – Single Family, 1 to 2 units per acre
- E. Zoning:** R1:B3 – Residential Single-family, 20,000  
square feet minimum lot area
- F. Description of Project:**

***ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING***

**Location.** The subject property is located in the San Geronimo Valley, on Lagunitas Road, in the unincorporated community of Lagunitas. The property encompasses 0.41 acres of land that is accessed from Lagunitas Road. An unnamed, seasonal - perennial (intermittent in dry years) tributary of San Geronimo Creek runs through the center-easterly portion of the property in a northwestern trajectory, with steep banks that confine the stream. The entire property is located within 100 feet of the stream and is therefore in the Stream Conservation Area designated by the Marin Countywide Plan for the Inland-Rural Corridor. Overall, the property is gently sloped, with an average grade of approximately 8 percent. The topography slopes to the southwest from Lagunitas Road on the east side of the site toward the stream and on

the other side of the bank the property slopes to the northwest, towards the stream. The stream flows from the subject property northwest approximately 750 feet to its confluence with San Geronimo Creek.

**Habitat Present.** The 0.41-acre property consists of fragmented mixed grassland-evergreen woodland with the majority of the site being characterized by disturbed area supporting non-native weedy vegetation. The two sensitive biological communities onsite include willow (*Arroyo ssp.*), and the unnamed stream. The willow stand is located downstream from the two bridges. The dominant soil type is Dipsea-Barnabe very gravelly loams.

**Special Status Plant Species.** A biologist report was prepared for the subject property which identified a list of 16 species with potential to be located near the property. Of the 16 species, none had potential habitat within the area of proposed development. A site visit was conducted on August 31, 2011 by a qualified biologist, and the report of that visit dated September 9, 2011 notes no special status plant species were identified on the subject property. The unnamed intermittent stream is a tributary of San Geronimo Creek, which supports small runs of Coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) and Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Therefore, according to the applicant's biological report, the project site qualifies under State Statutes as Waters of the State and as habitat for a Sensitive Biological Community.

**Special Status Wildlife Species.** The biologist report also contained a list of 56 special status wildlife species with potential to be located near the property. Of the 56 species, none were observed on the subject property; however, the Olive-sided Flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*) has a high potential to occur in the project area. The remainder of the species are unlikely to occur in the project area due to unsuitable habitat conditions.

**Streams and Wetlands.** As discussed above, an unnamed tributary of San Geronimo Creek traverses the subject property. The entire site is located within the CWP 100-foot Stream Conservation Area (SCA) established for the Inland Rural Corridor in which the San Geronimo Valley watershed is located.

**Geology.** A geotechnical evaluation was conducted in 2011 and provides recommendations for construction on the project site. No significant development constraints were noted; although the report prudently recommends elevating the structure a minimum of 2 feet above grade to avoid any flooding (the project site is not located in an identified 100-year floodplain).

**Water Supply.** The pre-existing residence and potential new development would be served by the Marin Municipal Water District.

### ***PROPOSED PROJECT***

The applicant proposes to complete the demolition of a pre-existing 870-square foot residence (of which all but 265 square feet have already been demolished) and construct a new residence on the vacant lot. The total proposed building area would be 1,429 square feet, consisting of 941 square feet of floor area and a 488 square foot garage. The proposal also includes 46 square feet of covered porches. The proposed project would result in a floor area ratio (FAR) of approximately 5 percent

on the 17,890 square foot lot. The proposed residence would reach a maximum height of 22 feet above surrounding grade and the exterior walls would have the following minimum setbacks: 20 feet from the top of the stream bank; 62 feet from the eastern front property line; 66 feet from the northern side property line; 26 feet from the southern side property line; and 8 feet 3 inches from the western rear property line. Various site improvements are also proposed, including a vehicle bridge and a footbridge across the stream, a new septic system, a six foot high fence in the front yard, low retaining walls, a parking area made of pervious pavers, and landscaping.

The proposal includes an Advantex septic system with the septic tank, sand filter, and pump chamber located at least 20 feet from the stream top-of-bank. A new asphalt and interlocking paver driveway and new 'bottomless' culvert spanning the stream would replace both the recent as-built, unpermitted 36 inch round stream culvert and driveway located along the south property line, and the existing historical gravel driveway and round culvert located to the north. The historical vehicular access and culvert is proposed to be removed and replaced with a pedestrian bridge.

The applicant proposes additional impervious surface on the site by increasing the footprint area and square footage of the residence from 870 square feet to 941 square feet with a 488 square foot attached garage (1,412 square feet of building lot coverage) as well as pervious paving for the parking area. The current, recently-poured foundation located approximately a minimum of 4 feet from the nearest top of streambank is proposed to be removed. Grading amounts are estimated as 85 cubic yards of cut, 30 cubic yards of fill, with an import of 38 cubic yards for the septic system and total off-haul of 55 cubic yards. The applicant is also proposing to replace the two existing round culverts with a pedestrian bridge spanning the entire streambed, along which utility laterals would be connected, and a bottomless culvert for the vehicle bridge. Landscaping would entail replanting the stream area with a variety of native riparian species, replacing the low, non-native vegetation that is predominant near the house. No native trees are proposed to be removed, and several will be planted.

Variance approval is required for the residence's proposed encroachment into the 20-foot (20 percent of the 100-foot average lot depth) required rear yard in the R-1:B-3 zoning district. Design Review is required for the proposed development of a vacant lot within the Stream Conservation Area of a mapped anadromous stream or its tributaries pursuant to Marin County Code (MCC) Section 22.42.045.

### **III. CIRCULATION AND REVIEW**

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is being circulated for a 30-day review and comment period pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15073. It is being circulated to all agencies that have jurisdiction over the subject property or the natural resources affected by the project and to consultants, community groups, and interested parties to attest to the completeness and adequacy of the information contained in the Initial Study as it relates to the concerns which are germane to the agency's or organization's jurisdictional authority or to the interested parties' issues.

Marin County Agencies:

- Marin County Department of Public Works (DPW)
- Marin County Community Development Agency, Environmental Health Services Division
- Marin County Fire Department

Trustee and Responsible Agencies:

- National Marine Fisheries Services
- US Department of Fish and Wildlife
- US Army Corp of Engineers
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board

#### **IV. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Pursuant to Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and the County EIR Guidelines, Marin County will prepare an Initial Study for all projects not categorically exempt from the requirements of CEQA. The Initial Study evaluation is a preliminary analysis of a project which provides the County with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration. The points enumerated below describe the primary procedural steps undertaken by the County in completing an Initial Study checklist evaluation and, in particular, the manner in which significant environmental effects of the project are made and recorded.

- A.** The determination of significant environmental effect is to be based on substantial evidence contained in the administrative record and the County's environmental data base consisting of factual information regarding environmental resources and environmental goals and policies relevant to Marin County. As a procedural device for reducing the size of the Initial Study document, relevant information sources cited and discussed in topical sections of the checklist evaluation are incorporated by reference into the checklist (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Each of these information sources has been assigned a number which is shown in parenthesis following each topical question and which corresponds to a number on the data base source list provided herein as Attachment 1. See the sample question below. Other sources used or individuals contacted may also be cited in the discussion of topical issues where appropriate.
- B.** In general, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either the Initial Study demonstrates that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have one or more significant effects on the environment. A Negative Declaration shall also be prepared if the Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects, but revisions to the project made by or agreed to by the applicant prior to release of the Negative Declaration for public review would avoid or reduce such effects to a level of less than significance, and there is no substantial evidence before the Lead County Department that the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment. A signature block is provided in Section VII of this Initial Study to verify that the project sponsor has agreed to incorporate mitigation measures into the project in conformance with this requirement.

- C. All answers to the topical questions must take into account the whole of the action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. Significant unavoidable cumulative impacts shall be identified in Section V of this Initial Study (Mandatory Findings of Significance).
- D. A brief explanation shall be given for all answers except "Not Applicable" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead County Department cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "Not Applicable" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "Not Applicable" answer shall be discussed where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- E. "Less Than Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is found to be less than significant based on the project as proposed and without the incorporation of mitigation measures recommended in the Initial Study.
- F. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated" applies where the incorporation of recommended mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead County Department must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section IV, "Earlier Analyses", may be cross-referenced).
- G. "Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the Lead County Department lacks information to make a finding that the effect is less than significant. If there are one or more effects which have been determined to be significant and unavoidable, an EIR shall be required for the project.
- H. The answers in this checklist have also considered the current State California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines and Appendix G contained in those Guidelines.

**IV. ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):**

**1. LAND USE AND PLANNING.**

*Would the proposal:*

a) <b>Conflict with applicable Countywide Plan designation or zoning standards? (source #(s): 1, 6, 7)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The subject property is governed by the land use designation contained in the Marin Countywide Plan and by zoning standards contained in Title 22 of the Marin County Code.

Marin Countywide Plan (CWP)

The Marin Countywide Plan (CWP) designates the subject property SF4 – Single Family, Rural/Residential. The proposed project is consistent with the SF4 land use designation established by the CWP because it includes the construction of a single family residence and associated accessory structures.

Development Code

The subject property is governed by R1:B3 – Residential Single-family, 20,000 square foot minimum lot area zoning. The principally permitted use allowed in this district is single-family residential development. The maximum allowed height for the main residence in the R1:B3 zoning district is 30 feet above surrounding grade and the maximum height allowed for detached accessory structures is 15 feet above grade.

The maximum height of the proposed residence would be 22 feet above surrounding grade. The closest portion of the proposed residence would be 8 feet 3 inches from the westerly (rear) property line.

The rear setback normally required in the R1:B3 zoning district is 25 feet or 20 percent of the average lot depth, whichever is less. With an average lot depth of 100 feet, the required setback is 20 feet; therefore a part of this application is a Variance to encroach into the rear setback.

With approval of the variance, the project will be consistent with the R1:B3 zoning district in terms of setbacks, and is consistent with other regulations for development in the district.

<b>b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by Marin County? (source #(s): 1, 6, 7, 8)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]	[ ]

The environmental protection policies contained in Marin Countywide Plan policies that pertain to the proposed project include the following: (1) protection of riparian systems; (2) protection of Stream Conservation Areas; (3) species and habitat preservation; (4) prevention of air, water, and noise pollution; (5) protection of visual resources and amenities; (6) protection of trees; (7) minimization of grading activities; and (8) appropriate streamside development and erosion control. The relevant policies are listed below, followed by the policy analyses.

On April 3, 2014 the California Court of Appeal entered its final opinion and judgment in the matter of Salmon Protection and Watershed Network v. County of Marin. In its judgment the Court of Appeal ordered the Marin County Superior Court to issue a writ of mandate to the County "...directing the county to set aside its approval of the 2007 CWP and certification of the related EIR with respect to the San Geronimo watershed only, pending preparation of a supplemental EIR with respect to the San Geronimo Valley only that analyzes cumulative impacts in conformity" with the relevant CEQA Guidelines and describes mitigation measures or makes other relevant findings also in conformance the CEQA Guidelines. Since the matter before the Court of Appeal



involved solely an attack on the County's stream conservation area policies with respect to coho salmon and steelhead trout, the County will be applying the environmental quality, biological resource, and protection policies of its 1994 CWP with respect to projects in the San Geronimo Valley pending approval of the supplemental EIR. All other policies shall continue to come from the 2007 CWP update.

### **1994 Countywide Plan Policies**

***Policy EQ-2.1 - Value of Riparian System.*** *Riparian systems, streams and their riparian and woodland habitat are irreplaceable and should be officially recognized and protected as essential environmental resources, because of their values for erosion control, water quality, fish and wildlife, aesthetics, recreation, and the health of human communities.*

***Policy EQ-2.2 - Streams Defined as Blue Lines on USGS Quad Maps.*** *All perennial and intermittent streams, which are defined as natural watercourses shown as solid or dashed blue lines on the most recent appropriate USGS quad sheet, should be subject to these stream and streamside protection policies. A perennial stream is further defined as:*

*A watercourse that flows throughout the year (except for infrequent or extended periods of drought), although surface water flow may be temporarily discontinuous in some reaches of the channel such as between pools."*

*An Intermittent stream is further defined as:*

*A watercourse that flows during the wet season, continues to flow after the period of precipitation, and ceases surface flow during at least part of the dry season.*

*An ephemeral stream should be subject to these policies if it supports riparian vegetation for a length of 100 feet or more. An ephemeral stream which does not support vegetation for 100 feet or more may also be subject to the SCA policies if it is demonstrated that the stream has value for flood control, water quality, or habitat which supports rare, endangered, or migratory species. An ephemeral stream is defined as:*

*A watercourse which carries only surface runoff and flows during and immediately after periods of precipitation.*

***Policy EQ-2.3 - Definition of Stream Conservation Areas.*** *A SCA should be designated along all natural watercourses shown as a solid or dashed blue line on the most recent appropriate USGS quad sheet, or along all watercourses supporting riparian vegetation for a length of 100 feet or more.*

*The zones consist of the watercourse itself between the tops of the banks and a strip of land extending laterally outward from the top of both banks, to a width of 100 feet on each side in the Coastal Recreation and Inland Rural Corridors, and to a width of 50 feet on each side in the City-Centered Corridor on smaller infill lots. Where large tracts of land in the City-Centered Corridor are proposed for development, the 100-foot buffer should be applied, where consistent with legal requirements, and other planning and*

environmental goals. In the Coastal Recreation and Inland Rural Corridors, the zone should be extended, if necessary, to include an area 50 feet landward from the edge of riparian vegetation.

**Policy EQ-2.4 - Land uses in Stream Conservation Areas.** The following uses are permitted in the SCA by development permits, provided these uses are allowed by the underlying zoning:

- All currently existing structures and uses including reconstruction and repairs
- Necessary water supply projects
- Flood control projects
- Projects to improve fish and wildlife habitat
- Grazing of livestock and other agricultural uses
- Maintenance of water channels for erosion control and other purposes
- Road and utility line crossings
- Water monitoring installation
- Trails

**Policy EQ-2.5 - Prohibited Land Uses in Stream Conservation Areas.** The following new uses are prohibited in the SCA:

- Roads and utility lines, except at crossings
- Confinement of livestock
- Dumping or disposal of refuse
- Use of motorized recreational vehicles
- Any structural improvement (excluding repairs) other than those identified in Policy EQ-2.4, including residences, barns, and storage building, unless allowed by a development permit in Policy EQ-2.6

**Policy EQ-2.6 - Other Allowable Land Uses in the Stream Conservation Areas.** Other uses may be allowed in the SCA by development permit, provided these uses conform to all other policies for SCAs and are:

- Allowed by the underlying zoning
- On existing parcels that fall entirely within the zone
- On existing parcels where it can be conclusively demonstrated that development on any other part of the parcel would have more adverse effect on water quality or other environmental impact.

**Policy EQ-2.8 - Retention of the Natural Vegetation.** The retention of the natural vegetation in an SCA should be encouraged in order to realize benefits such as soil erosion prevention, stream, shade, etc. When vegetation must be removed and soil disturbed within the SCA, or when vegetation has been destroyed or eliminated, the area should be re-seeded or replanted with native plants of the habitat as soon as possible. Broom and other aggressive exotic plants should be removed and replaced with native plants.

**Policy EQ-2.9 - Minimal Disturbance of Vegetation.** Disturbance of vegetation within the SCA should be minimized or avoided whenever possible. Minimizing or avoiding disturbance of streamside vegetation is particularly important for trees and shrubs which provide shade, stability for the streambank, and wildlife habitat. Vegetation may partially block streams creating a ponding effect which may be beneficial fish habitat.

*Tree growth may be cleared from the stream channel when it unduly restricts flood flows, to protect health, safety, and welfare.*

***Policy EQ-2.10 - Tree and Shrub Plantings.*** *Trees and shrubs to be planted along watercourses should include a variety of species that would naturally grow in or near the stream. In general, the planting of exotic trees should be avoided. When removal of riparian vegetation is unavoidable, and mitigation is required, replacement should be at a 2:1 ratio, whenever feasible. Enhancement and restoration of culverted streams is encouraged, whenever feasible.*

Consistent To prevent adverse impacts resulting from development along watercourses, the 1994 Countywide Plan has defined Stream Conservation Areas along major streams in Marin County. San Geronimo Creek and its unnamed tributary on the subject property are natural blue line watercourses subject to the SCA policies contained in the Countywide Plan. Because of its location within the Inland Rural Corridor, the SCA on this property extends laterally outward 100 feet from the top of all stream banks. Based on the biological report, there is limited riparian vegetation so that the SCA does not need to be extended an additional distance. However, the entire property is located within the SCA and it is not possible to construct a project outside the 100-foot SCA.

As explained in Policies EQ-2.4 through EQ-2.6, the proposed project is allowed within the SCA because the construction of a single-family residence is an allowed use in the R1:B3 zoning district and the property falls entirely within the SCA.

Consistent with Policies EQ 2.8-2.9, and EQ 2.15 and 2.18, the applicant is proposing a variety of beneficial design elements, including replacing the existing impervious culverts with stream-bridging improvements that will allow restoration of the natural streambed underneath. In addition to restoring the benthic environment underneath the stream crossings, the structures will allow re-infiltration where there currently is none, provide shade and shelter for aquatic organisms, and allow for natural sediment transport downstream into the watershed. Further, the Department of Public Works imposes uniformly applied standards related to hydrological analysis, drainage system design, and erosion control that safeguard natural resources.

However, despite these beneficial project elements and uniformly applied standards, the project would still result in significant adverse effects to the stream related to riparian habitat, stream flow patterns, and erosion. As discussed in the sections below related to biological and hydrological impacts, mitigations include requiring the proposed upper culvert to be redesigned, the proposed lower footbridge to be eliminated, and additional riparian planting (Mitigation Measures 4.C.1 and 8.A.1). These mitigations will result in the project causing less than significant impacts to the stream corridor. Therefore, the project is consistent with Policies EQ-2.1 through 2.6 relative to the SCA.

***Policy EQ-2.18 - Soil Disturbance.*** *Soil disturbance should be discouraged within the SCA. Where absolutely necessary it should be limited to the smallest surface area and volume of soil possible and for the shortest practical length of time.*

**Policy EQ-2.19 - Surface Runoff.** *Surface runoff rates in excess of pre-development levels should not be allowed where a new problem will be created or where the runoff will exacerbate an existing problem.*

**Policy EQ-2.20 - Retention of Sediment.** *On-site facilities for the retention of sediments or contribution toward regional sediment control measures produced by development should be provided during construction and, if necessary, upon project completion. Continued maintenance of these facilities should be required.*

**Policy EQ-2.23 - Seasonal Development Factors.** *Development work adjacent to and affecting SCAs should be done during the dry season only, except for emergency repairs. Disturbed surfaces should be stabilized and replanted, and areas where woody vegetation has been removed should be replanted with suitable species before the beginning of the rainy season.*

Consistent. Marin Countywide Plan Policies EQ-2.18 through EQ-2.20 and EQ-2.23 discuss erosion and sedimentation control and prevention of runoff where it will exacerbate an existing problem. Geophysical Section IV.3 of this Initial Study analyzes the potential effects of the project on erosion and drainage systems and implementation of required and standard best management practices that will avoid potentially significant impacts caused by soil erosion from excavation, grading, fill, and increased human activity. Additionally, Mitigation Measures 4.C.1 and 8.A.1 will require the applicant to plant additional riparian vegetation along the stream channel banks and for the bridge to meet DPW standards to avoid erosion.

**Policy EQ-2.87 - Species Preservation in the Environmental Review Process.** *Environmental review of development applications shall consider the impact of the proposed development on species and habitat diversity. Environmental review documents should propose mitigation measures for ensuring the protection of the habitat and species therein.*

**Policy EQ-2.88 - Protection of Special Status Species.** *Development shall be restricted or modified in areas which contain special status species and migratory species of the Pacific Flyway and/or significant natural areas, wetlands, riparian habitats, and freshwater habitats, to ensure the continued health and survival of these species and areas.*

Consistent. Section IV.7 - Biological Resources of this Initial Study analyzes the potential effects of the project on existing sensitive species and habitats consistent with Policy EQ-2.87. The applicant submitted a biological report that concludes the project will have a less than significant impact on special status plants and wildlife. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with Policies EQ-2.87 and EQ-2.88 because any potential impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level. Please refer to the Biological Resources Section IV.7 below for a more detailed analysis of this issue.

**Policy EQ-3.16 - Minimize Excavation, Grading, and Filling.** *New development in the County shall adhere to the standards of the Department of Public Works in order to minimize excavating, grading, and filling, while allowing for adequate access.*

Consistent. The project has been designed to minimize the extent of excavation, grading, and fill. The project is located on the level, currently developed portion of the site, so that limited grading is required.

As discussed in the Geophysical Section IV.3.b below, during the building permit process, the applicant will submit an erosion control and sedimentation plan that includes standard best management practices to ensure that impacts associated with erosion and sediment are minimized during and after construction. The project will be designed by a qualified professional engineer and will be subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works in accordance with Marin County codes. Further, Mitigation Measure 4.C.1 will require the upper bridge to be redesigned to meet DPW standards. This will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level and ensure conformance with Policy EQ-3.16.

***Policy EQ-3.21 - Streamside Development.*** *Along streams, development must retain the natural vegetation, prevent water pollution, and minimize flood hazard from runoff.*

Consistent. As addressed in the Geophysical, Water, and Biological Resources sections below, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the blue line stream located on the subject property due to mitigation measures requiring that the lower bridge be eliminated, the upper bridge be properly designed, and the stream bank be planted with riparian plants. Thus, the project will be consistent with this policy.

***Policy EQ-3.6 - Wildlife, Vegetation, and Habitats.*** *A diversity and abundance of wildlife and marine life shall be maintained. Vegetation and animal habitats shall be preserved wherever possible.*

Consistent. As discussed in the Biological Resources Section IV.7, the project will not result in significant impacts to fish, wildlife, vegetation, or animal habitats. Mitigation Measure 8.A.2 related to nesting birds during the building permit process will reduce potentially significant impacts caused by wildlife habitats to less than significant levels. Therefore, the project is consistent with Policy EQ-3.6.

### **2007 Countywide Plan Policies**

#### ***Policies AIR-1.2 and 1.3 - Meet Air Quality Standards.***

The proposed project will result in potentially significant impacts on air quality relating to dust and vehicle-related emissions during construction. However, implementation of the standard County permit requirements and the mitigation measure contained in the Air Quality Section IV.5 of this Initial Study will ensure conformance with the identified policy by reducing air quality impacts to a less than significant level and will ensure compliance with the identified policy. Consequently the proposed project is consistent with Policies AIR-1.2 and 1.3.

#### ***Policies WR-1.3 and WR 2.3 - Improve infiltration and Avoid Erosion and Sedimentation.***

Additionally, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or discharge of sediments or pollutants into surface runoff because excavation and drainage improvements would comply with the Marin County standards and best management

practices required by the Department of Public Works during the building permit process. Therefore the project is consistent with these policies.

Additionally, erosion will be avoided with the collection and dispersal of runoff through appropriate drainage systems and erosion control measures required to comply with Marin County standards. Please refer to Geophysical Section IV.3 below for additional discussion of these issues.

The proposed project may potentially result in secondary impacts to adjacent water sources. However, implementation of the standard County permit requirements and mitigation measures contained in the Water Section IV.4 of this Initial Study will ensure conformance with the identified policy by reducing the potential drainage and pollution impacts to the stream to a less than significant level.

***Policy NO-1. Noise. Protection from excessive noise.***

The proposed project will create two types of noise impacts: noise associated with construction activities and noise associated with residential uses. Noise Section IV.10 concludes that the noise associated with construction activities and with the proposed improvements will be less than significant, ensuring compliance with the identified policy.

Consistent. While the project may contribute minimally to air, water, and noise pollution, no significant effects related to air, water, or noise pollution are identified that are not reduced to less than significant by design or uniformly applied standards. Therefore, the project will be consistent with this policy.

***Policy BIO-1.3 – Protect Woodlands, Forests, and Tree Removal.*** *The County shall strive to protect large trees, trees with historical importance, and oak woodland habitat, and prevent the untimely removal of trees through implementation of tree preservation ordinance.*

Consistent. No native trees will be removed. The landscape plan includes the planting of additional native trees. The existing woodland habitat at the site will be preserved. Therefore, the project is consistent with Policy EQ-3.14.

***Policies EH-2.1 and EH-2.3. Safety from Seismic and Geologic Hazards.*** *Protect people and property from risks associated with seismic activity and geologic hazards.*

Consistent. The subject property is not located within an Earthquake Study Zone. Although a fault line has been identified in the vicinity, standard design and construction measures will be implemented to avoid or minimize potential impacts related to soil stability, seismicity, and landslides.

***Policies EH-3.1 and EH-3.2. Safety from Flooding and Inundation.*** *Utilize regulations instead of flood control projects whenever possible to minimize losses in areas where flooding is inevitable. Ensure that flow capacity is maintained in stream channels and floodplains, and achieve flood control using biotechnical techniques instead of storm drains, culverts, riprap, and other forms of structural stabilization.*

Consistent. As discussed in the Water Section IV.4, compliance with code requirements will reduce potentially significant impacts caused by flooding to less than significant

levels. Therefore, the project is consistent with these policies. The project will meet flood control requirements, as verified by the Department of Public Works during the Building Permit process.

***Policies EH-4.1 and EH-4.2. Safety from Fires. Ensure that adequate fire protection is provided in new development. Abate the buildup of vegetation around structures.***

Consistent. The project will meet all fire safety requirements, as verified by the local fire protection district during the Building Permit process, including, but not limited to the approval of a vegetation management plan.

***Policy DES-4.1 and DES-4.e – Protection of Scenic Resources. Protect scenic quality and views of the natural environment – including ridgelines and upland greenbelts, hillsides, water, and tree- from adverse impacts related to development.***

Consistent: The visual resources of the subject property and community will not be adversely impacted by the project because the project is compatible in design and size to other homes in the community and will be adequately landscaped. No native trees will be removed. Overall, the proposed improvements have been sited with adequate setbacks to surrounding property lines and will not significantly impact the views, light, or privacy of adjoining properties, thus ensuring compliance with the identified policy. Please refer to Aesthetics/Visual Resources Section IV.13 below for further discussion.

***Policies HS-2.2, HS-2.3, and DES-3.b. Well-designed Housing. Promote design that fits into the context of the neighborhood.***

Consistent. As verified during the design review project, the project will fit within the context of the neighborhood, minimize the perception of mass and bulk, and comply with the Single-family Residential Design Guidelines and the planned district development standards in MCC 22.16.

### **San Geronimo Valley Community Plan**

The San Geronimo Valley Community Plan is incorporated as part of the Marin Countywide Plan and includes more detailed policies that pertain specifically to the San Geronimo community, including, but not limited to, policies that address natural resources, rural character and village identity, tree preservation, and stream protection. The proposed project is consistent with the land use policies and programs in the Community Plan based on the following reasons: 1) it is not located on a visually prominent ridgeline, 2) it will preserve existing water courses, 3) grading will be minimized, 4) no existing native trees and riparian vegetation will be removed, 5) the building is designed with mass, colors, and materials that are compatible with the surrounding area and maintains the rural character, 6) it will not adversely affect historic or archeological resources.

<b>c) Affect agricultural resources, operations, or contracts (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, impacts from incompatible land uses, or conflicts with Williamson Act contracts)?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6, 7,9)	<b>Significant Impact</b>  [ ]	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>  [ ]	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>  [ X ]	<b>Not Applicable</b>  [ ]
--	--------------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------

The project site is designated for residential development by the Marin Countywide Plan and within a residential zoning district. The project site is not under agricultural or forest land production, and there is no existing zoning for agricultural/forest use or a Williamson Act contract. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>d) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6, 7, 8)	<b>Significant Impact</b>  [ ]	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>  [ ]	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>  [ X ]	<b>Not Applicable</b>  [ ]
---	--------------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------

The project site is located on Lagunitas Road, which is characterized by rural, low density residential development. The project would result in the replacement of a pre-existing single-family residence and would not result in the direct or indirect physical division of an established community. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>e) Result in substantial alteration of the character or functioning of the community, or present or planned use of an area?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6, 7, 8)	<b>Significant Impact</b>  [ ]	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>  [ ]	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>  [ X ]	<b>Not Applicable</b>  [ ]
---	--------------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------

The project site was previously developed with a single-family residence and the project would continue the residential use of the property. The visual character of the new development would be in keeping with the existing neighborhood and community because it would only consist of a residence, attached garage, and various accessory structures. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>f) Substantially increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities, or affect existing recreational opportunities?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6, 7)	<b>Significant Impact</b>  [ ]	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>  [ ]	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>  [ X ]	<b>Not Applicable</b>  [ ]
---	--------------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------



The project would merely replace a pre-existing residence and would not increase demand on neighborhood or regional parks or other such facilities. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**2. POPULATION AND HOUSING.**

*Would the proposal:*

<p><b>a) Increase density that would exceed official population projections for the planning area within which the project site is located as set forth in the Countywide Plan and/or community plan? (source #(s): 1, 6, 7)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ X ]</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>
--	---	---	---	---

The project would not result in an increase in density that would exceed official population projections for the planning area. The project conforms to the Marin CWP SF4 land use designation, which allows for 1 to 2 units per acre. Further, the project is replacing a pre-existing residence. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<p><b>b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? (source #(s): 1, 6, 7)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ X ]</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>
---	---	---	---	---

The proposed project would not induce substantial growth because it would result in the replacement of a pre-existing residence and is consistent with the density standards contained in the Marin CWP and Marin County Development Code. Further, the project site is currently served by existing roads and utilities and would not require substantial investment in additional infrastructure. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<p><b>c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? (source #(s): 1, 6, 7)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ X ]</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>
---	---	---	---	---

The project would not displace affordable housing because it entails the replacement of a pre-existing residence. The new residence would be located in approximately the same location as the pre-existing residence to be demolished. Further, the project

would not involve the removal of any other residences. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**3. GEOPHYSICAL. *Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:***

<b>a) Location in an area of geologic hazards, including but not necessarily limited to: 1) active or potentially active fault zones; 2) landslides or mudslides; 3) slope instability or ground failure; 4) subsidence; 5) expansive soils; 6) liquefaction; 7) tsunami; or 8) similar hazards? (source #(s): 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project site is located within the seismically active San Francisco Bay region but outside of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest active fault is the San Andreas Fault, located approximately 4.3 miles west of the project site. No active faults are known to traverse through the project site; therefore the possibility of surface fault rupture onsite is very low. Although fault rupture is not necessarily bound by the limits of a fault hazard zone, it is considered unlikely to occur in areas outside of the mapped fault rupture hazard zone. Therefore, based on the current project location and design, there would be a less than significant impact with respect to active or potentially active fault zones.

A site investigation conducted for the project site did not disclose any significant geologic hazards (land or mudslides, slope instability, subsidence, or expansive soils). The soils most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, uniformly graded, saturated, and fine-grained and occur close to the ground surface, usually at depths of less than 50 feet. The Association of Bay Area Governments has compiled a Liquefaction Susceptibility Map that shows the risk of liquefaction for the entire San Francisco Bay Area and the project site is in an area with very low risk of liquefaction. Further, the geotechnical investigation conducted for the project described the potential for liquefaction at the site as a relatively insignificant hazard. The project site is also not located within an area that is subject tsunami. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>b) Substantial erosion of soils due to wind or water forces and attendant siltation from excavation, grading, or fill? (source #(s): 1, 2, 8)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]	[ ]

The proposed project would not result in the substantial erosion of soils due to wind or water forces and attendant siltation from excavation, grading, or fill as the construction activities associated with the residence would require minimal land disturbing activities. Further, impacts related to the construction of the bridges would be reduced to less than significant levels by Mitigation Measure 4.C.1. The project site is relatively small, vegetated, and is surrounded by trees and other homes. As a result, soil erosion due to wind is unlikely. Water use during construction would also be minimal and would not result in substantial erosion of soils. Through the building permit process, the project would be required to implement standard measures for minimizing erosion per Marin County Code Title 24. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<p><b>c) Substantial changes in topography from excavation, grading or fill, including but not necessarily limited to: 1) ground surface relief features; 2) geologic substructures or unstable soil conditions; and 3) unique geologic or physical features? (source #(s): 1, 2, 8)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>
	<p>[ ]</p>	<p>[ ]</p>	<p>[ X ]</p>	<p>[ ]</p>

The proposed project would not result in significant, adverse changes in topography or unstable soil conditions at the site due to grading. Pursuant to Marin County requirements, the proposed project would be designed by a qualified professional engineer and would be subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works in accordance with Marin County codes. Based on the application materials, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the environment because the development would not substantially reform the natural topography on the site and would avoid unique geologic features in the area. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**4. WATER. *Would the proposal result in:***

<p><b>a) Substantial changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (source #(s): 1, 3, 4, 8, 14)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>
	<p>[ ]</p>	<p>[ X ]</p>	<p>[ ]</p>	<p>[ ]</p>

The project would not increase or otherwise impact the volume of runoff generated from the project site. Further, the proposed project would be required to conform to all development restrictions in the Marin County Code regarding drainage, erosion and sediment control that requires runoff to be collected and dispersed on site. Further,

changes to the flow pattern of the stream would be minimized by Mitigation Measure 4.C.1. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards, including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) flooding; 2) debris deposition; or 3) similar hazards? (source #(s): 1, 10, 14)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project would not result in significant impacts to the environment due to water related hazards because according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency 2014 Flood Insurance Rate Map, the residence area is located outside of the areas prone to flooding and the bridge would be designed to have sufficient capacity for floodwaters to pass safely. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>c) Discharge of pollutants into surface or ground waters or other alteration of surface or ground water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (source #(s): 1, 6, 8, 10, 14)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]	[ ]

The proposed residence would be required to meet the requirements of Marin County Code regarding drainage and sedimentation and erosion control, which would protect surface waters from polluted runoff and would protect water bodies from nonpoint and point source pollution that may negatively impact water quality.

Technical specifications for building new bridges are subject to the review of the Department of Public Works (DPW). Preliminary comments from DPW staff list items that need to be addressed to meet their standards. This list includes requirements for additional studies, clarification of information, and detailed construction plans. DPW also requires that the applicant obtain all necessary authorization from State and Federal Agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. DPW staff's comments are based on the assumption that both the upper bridge and the footbridge will be constructed, but as mitigated, the project will not include the footbridge. DPW's requirements can generally be considered uniformly applied standards intended to safeguard the environment.

However, based on DPW staff's review of the application materials, it appears that the proposed design for the upper bridge does not contain enough room to allow for the water from a 100-year storm to flow underneath and would funnel the water at such high velocity that excessive scour and erosion would occur downstream. Further, construction of the bridge when water is flowing could cause erosion and turbidity. While replacing the existing culvert with a larger culvert with a natural bottom will

improve the existing situation, if the new bridge is improperly design or installed, it would result in significant adverse effects to the stream's water quality. Requiring the bridge to be redesigned in accordance with DPW's standards to provide enough room underneath it for a 100-year storm and constructing it while the channel is dry would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure 4.C.1**

The bridge shall be redesigned in accordance with DPW's standards to provide enough room underneath it for a 100-year storm and constructing it while the channel is dry.

**Monitoring Measure 4.C.1**

Before issuance of a Building Permit, the CDA shall confirm with DPW that their requirements for the design and installation of the upper bridge have been satisfied.

<b>d) Substantial change in the amount of surface water in any water body or ground water either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through intersection of an aquifer by cuts or excavations? (source #(s): 1, 6, 8, 14)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the environment due to direct water withdrawals or additions. A hydrology study prepared by William Clark, P.E. determined that the project would not result in a significant increase in runoff to the onsite stream. Drainage improvements would be required as part of standard building permit requirements. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>e) Substantial changes in the flow of surface or ground waters, including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) currents; 2) rate of flow; or 3) the course or direction of water movements? (source #(s): 1, 6, 8, 14)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]	[ ]

A hydrologic study of on-site and downstream drainage ways was conducted and concluded that the construction of the residence will not result in a significant increase in runoff. Impacts related to the construction of the bridge have been addressed by Mitigation Measures 4.C.1. Project improvements would be designed to minimize flood hydrograph peak flow or flood volume increases into drainage courses. This is achieved through the design features such as porous pavers, maximizing overall permeability, drainage infiltration, and bridge design. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

f) <b>Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?</b> (source #(s): )	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The proposed project involves replacing a pre-existing residence and would not substantially increase the previous use of water supplies. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**5. AIR QUALITY. *Would the proposal:***

a) <b>Generate substantial air emissions that could violate official air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</b> (source #(s): 1, 15, 16, 17, 18)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]	[ ]

The project is located in unincorporated Marin County within the San Francisco Bay Area (Bay Area) Air Basin. Air quality in the Bay Area Air Basin is governed by the Bay Area Air Quality Air Management District (BAAQMD). The Bay Area Air Basin is currently classified as non-attainment for the 1-hour State ozone standard as well as for the federal and State 8-hour standards. Additionally, the Bay Area Air Basin is classified as non-attainment for the State 24-hour and annual arithmetic mean PM10 standards as well as the State annual arithmetic mean and the national 24-hour PM2.5 standards. The Bay Area Air Basin is unclassified or classified as attainment for all other pollutants standards.

The proposed project would generate criteria pollutant emissions during construction and operation. Construction-related emissions would result from off road, heavy equipment operating at the project site to construct the new residence and from truck trips associated with deliveries and construction workers commuting to and from the project site. Emissions associated with operation would include those from routine residential activities such as car trips, routine painting, and other maintenance activities.

To determine the significance of the project impact that would be related to the potential for it to cause or contribute to an air quality standard violation, Marin County utilizes the screening criteria provided in the 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. The screening criteria for single-family residences is 114 dwelling units for emissions generated during construction of the project and 325 dwelling units for emissions generated during operation of the project, provided all basic construction mitigation measures are including during construction. Therefore, construction and operation of the project would not result in a violation of an air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation with implementation of

Mitigation Measure AIR-1 as it entails the expansion of one existing single-family residence. The associated impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

**Mitigation Measure 5.A**

The project applicant and/or its construction contractors shall implement the following applicable BAAQMD basic control measures:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, and graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times a day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to a maximum of 15 miles per hour.
5. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Tile 13, Section 2485 of California of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
6. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

**Monitoring Measure 5.A**

During construction, County staff conducting routine inspections shall verify that the applicant and contractors are following are implementing the applicable BAAQMD basic control measures.

<b>b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, such as noxious fumes or fugitive dust? (source #(s): 1, 15, 16, 17, 18 )</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The BAAQMD recommends that lead agencies assess the incremental toxic air contaminant (TAC) exposure risk to all sensitive receptors within a 1,000-foot radius of a project’s fence line. Long-term operations that would be associated with the project would result in no new TAC emissions. However, project construction activities would generate diesel particulate matter (DPM), which is considered to be a TAC. The majority of DPM exhaust emissions that would be generated at the project site would be due to the use of diesel off-road equipment.

The closest sensitive receptors to the proposed project site would be neighboring residences on Lagunitas Road and Spring Avenue. The closest residences would be at

a distance of approximately 50 feet from the project activities. The nearest school is located in the community of San Geronimo, approximately 1.5 miles east of the project site.

The dose to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor affecting health risk from exposure to TACs. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance or substances in the environment and the duration of exposure to the substance. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), health risk assessments, which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions, should be based on a 70-year exposure period when assessing TACs (such as DPM) that have only cancer or chronic non-cancer health effects. However, such health risk assessments should be limited to the duration of the emission-producing activities associated with the project.

For the project, DPM emissions that would be generated near the sensitive receptors would be limited to a period of up to a few months. Because these emissions would be minor and occur for over a few months in the vicinity of the residences compared to the 70-year exposure used in health risk assessments, project-related DPM emissions would not be considered substantial and would not result in a significant incremental cancer risk. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? (source #(s): 1, 19)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

Moderate winds and mild temperatures throughout the year characterize the climate of the area. Implementation of the project would not result in considerable alterations to climatic conditions because the proposed project would result in the construction of only one new residence, and would not be industrial or involve the installation of large-scale Wind Energy Conversion (WEC) systems. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>d) Create objectionable odors? (source #(s): 1, 19)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

Operation of the project would not create odorous emissions; however, project construction would include sources, such as diesel equipment, which could result in the creation of objectionable odors. Since the construction activities would be temporary and spatially dispersed, and generally take place in a rural area, these activities would not affect a substantial number of people. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.



**6. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. *Would the proposal:***

<b>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (source #(s): 15, 16, 17, 18)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during construction and operation. Construction emissions would be generated onsite due to the use of heavy-duty off-road equipment associated with construction of the proposed residence (i.e., excavators, graders, front loaders, dump trucks, cranes, paving equipment, etc.). Operational emissions would result from the day to day use of the project site as a residence (car trips and electricity and natural gas consumption).

As discussed under section 5a above, Marin County has opted to utilize the screening criteria provided in the 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. The screening criterion for GHG emissions is 56 dwelling units. As the project would entail the construction and operation of one single-family residence, this project is not considered cumulatively considerable. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (source #(s): 1, 6)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The proposed Project would not conflict with certain GHG reduction goals set forth in AB 32, including the 39 Recommended Actions identified by CARB in its Climate Change Scoping Plan. The project would also not conflict with goals and policies contained in the Marin Countywide Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan. The project would be required to obtain building permits for construction, which would ensure compliance with all Title 24 and the Marin County Green Building Ordinance requirements. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**7. TRANSPORTATION/  
CIRCULATION. *Would the  
proposal result in:***

<b>a) Substantial increase in vehicle trips or traffic congestion such that existing levels of service on affected roadways will deteriorate below acceptable County standards? (source #(s): 1, 6, 8)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The level of service standards for roadways that are part of the Marin Congestion Management Program network are intended to regulate long-term traffic increases from operation of new development. There would be no new long-term trips associated with the proposed project, as the proposed project is replacing a pre-existing residence. Further, there would be no increase in long-term trips to the project site once the proposed project is completed. As such, the proposed project would not exceed level of service standards established by the Transportation Authority of Marin (the county congestion management agency) for designated Congestion Management Program roadways. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>b) Traffic hazards related to: 1) safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections); 2) barriers to pedestrians or bicyclists; or 3) incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? (source #(s): 1, 6, 8)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to traffic related hazards because the potential for the replacement of one residence would not result in any significant change to existing traffic patterns. Further, the proposed project would not alter the physical configuration of the existing roadway network serving the area, and would not introduce unsafe design features. The proposed project also would not introduce uses that are incompatible with existing uses already served by the road system that serves the project area. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (source #(s): 1, 6, 8)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
--	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The project would not result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses. The project involves the replacement an existing residence, which is accessed via Lagunitas Road. The proposed project would not include any work within public roadways, and access for emergency vehicles would not be obstructed. The number of short-term vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would not affect traffic flow for emergency service providers. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (source #(s): 1, 6, 8)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
---	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The proposed project would not result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site as the proposed project involves the replacement of a pre-existing residence. The proposed project has been reviewed by the Marin County Department of Public Works (DPW) for conformance with all development standards, and has been found to be in conformance with all requirements, including provisions for parking. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>e) Substantial impacts upon existing transportation systems, including rail, waterborne or air traffic systems? (source #(s): 1, 6, 8)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
---	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The proposed project would not impact existing transportation systems. The proposed project would replace a pre-existing residence, and is not located near existing transportation systems, including rail, waterborne, or air traffic systems. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**8. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.**

*Would the proposal result in:*

a) Reduction in the number of endangered, threatened or rare species, or substantial alteration of their habitats including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) plants; 2) fish; 3) insects; 4) animals; and 5) birds listed as special-status species by State or Federal Resource Agencies? (sources #(s): 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, 22, 23)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]	[ ]

The proposal includes a number of elements that are mitigative in nature to offset potential adverse impacts to the unnamed tributary and, indirectly, to San Geronimo Creek downstream from the property. Specifically, the downstream culvert is proposed to be replaced by a small pedestrian bridge and the upstream culvert replaced by a bottomless arched culvert that would reflect the conditions of a natural streambed better than the existing narrow concrete culvert. Culvert replacement would improve aquatic conditions in the unnamed tributary by allowing them to return to a natural bottom substrate in those stream segments, by reducing the amount of artificial impervious surfaces within the stream, by reducing localized erosional forces, and by slightly increasing the residence time of water within the stream. Bottomless culverts also allow for natural sediment transport, which is especially important in a watershed like Lagunitas because so much of the sediment transport is blocked by Peter’s Dam. No adverse impacts to the aquatic environment or downstream fishes would occur from these mitigative design elements, and design modifications would improve onsite conditions.

Further, the existing septic system would be abandoned and replaced with a new septic system that that would function better because it would meet current codes. Other beneficial project elements include using a permeable system of interlocking pavers for the driveway rather than asphalt; installation of a retaining wall along an eroded hillside to contain and prevent further erosion; and onsite riparian restoration along the stream, to include planting of dogwood (*Cornus glabrata*), coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), and Pacific wax myrtle (*Myrica californica*).

WRA Environmental Consultants conducted assessments of biological resources present or potentially present on the property. The biological report included a review of Marin County’s San Geronimo Watershed Stream Conservation Area map; the California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), and the Marin County Breeding Bird Atlas. The biologist also conducted fieldwork to identify plants and animals on the site, and assess the site for potential habitats. Biological regarding specific natural elements and special status species is summarized below.

### ***Riparian Habitat***

Although sixteen special-status plants have been documented in the region, WRA's biological assessment concluded the property has no potential to support these species because of its lack of suitable habitat and disturbed site conditions. The property consists of disturbed ground supporting non-native weedy vegetation, for the most part cleared of trees. Native vegetation on the site is limited to a small patch of willow (*Salix* sp.) and blackberry (*Rubus* sp.) associated with the portion of the unnamed San Geronimo Creek tributary and to vegetation within the tributary channel growing downstream of the proposed footbridge. The site's lack of suitable habitat stems from an absence of dependent or associated soil types and/or vegetation communities, and an elevation range that does not support the species. No impacts to rare plants would occur.

The unnamed, intermittent San Geronimo Creek tributary that traverses the property does not provide salmonid habitat. San Geronimo Creek downstream is inhabited by coho salmon and steelhead; thus, the onsite tributary's seasonal hydrological connection to San Geronimo Creek means there is potential for onsite activities to affect fish downstream in the form of excessive fine sediment transport and other potential forms of pollution. Further, although the proposal includes a number of environmentally sensitive design elements, increasing the lot coverage within the SCA limits the area for riparian or other beneficial vegetation to spread. This limitation on the area where riparian vegetation could spread partially prevents the re-establishment of a natural riparian corridor, and depletes the potential for biodiversity that a natural riparian corridor would provide. Therefore, the proposed project would result in significant adverse effects to the natural environment that need to be mitigated.

As noted in the description of the environmental setting, the only native riparian species on the site are the small patch of willow and blackberry growing just downstream of the proposed footbridge. These native species currently grow along approximately 50 linear feet of the stream on the southern portion of the site. However, by removing the existing lower culvert, rerouting the ground-level utility lines, and eliminating the footbridge from the plans, this native riparian corridor could be extended another 100 linear feet south to the upper culvert where the driveway crosses the stream. This would result in approximately 150 feet of the total 170 feet of the stream channel and banks that are within the property boundaries being vegetated in a more healthy natural condition. An increase of the existing 15 percent of the length of the site providing riparian habitat to almost 90 percent of the length of the site would substantially improve the habitat connectivity provided by the riparian corridor and fully mitigate the adverse effects resulting from increasing the lot coverage. See Mitigation Measure 8.A.1 below.

### ***Plants***

The biological assessment did not identify the potential for rare plants to occur on the project site. Although situated generally within a mature but fragmented mixed evergreen forest complex, the property consists of disturbed ground supporting non-native weedy vegetation, essentially cleared of trees. Native vegetation on the site is limited to a small patch of willow (*Salix* sp.) and blackberry (*Rubus* sp.) associated with downstream portions of the stream and to vegetation within the tributary channel. Although sixteen special-status plants have been documented in the region, the property has no potential to support these species because of its lack of suitable habitat and disturbed site conditions. No impacts to rare plants would occur.

## **Birds**

Marin County is inhabited by two subspecies of spotted owls, the northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) and the California spotted owl (*S.o.occidentalis*). The northern spotted owl is listed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act and is proposed for listing as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act. The California spotted owl is designated as a Species of Special Concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, which means that if the population continues to decline then the subspecies could end up being listed under the California Endangered Species Act in the future. Marin County is a relative stronghold for spotted owls, which breed in the coniferous forests between February 1 through July 31.

The terrestrial biological report for the project identified five spotted owl territories mapped within two miles of the proposed project, with the nearest occurrence being approximately 0.25-mile (400 meters/1,312 feet) northeast of the site. The report concluded that the proposed project site does not provide suitable nesting or foraging habitat for spotted owl and there would be no impact. This conclusion is strengthened by an additional discussion supporting the project's unlikely potential to result in indirect impacts on spotted owls if construction were to occur during the breeding season.

Like all breeding birds, owls are especially sensitive to disturbance during the breeding season. Generally speaking, construction activities during the breeding season could result in visual and noise-related disturbance, with excessive disturbance resulting in reproductive failure and the death, or "take", of an endangered species. To prevent this outcome, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued guidelines for *Estimating the Effects of Auditory and Visual Disturbance to Northern Spotted Owls and Marbled Murrelets in Northwestern California* and *Appendix B, Northern Spotted Owl Sound and Visual Harassment Support Tools* (2006).

Using these tools, the proposed project would have a visual disturbance distance of less than or equal to 100 meters (328 feet) and an auditory disturbance distance of 200 meters (656) feet, based on the activity's baseline noise levels and activity-generated noise levels fitting best into Scenario 7 of the guidelines: High Action-Generated Sounds in Special Habitat Subject to Moderate Human Sound-Generating Activity. Seasonal avoidance is preferable and would be implemented where feasible, but based on the mapped locations of known spotted owl territories and using the guidance for estimating auditory and visual disturbance distances, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to nesting owls if constructed during the breeding season.

Nesting birds and their nests and eggs are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Any activities resulting in reproductive failure would be a violation of federal law. The proposed project site could support a variety of avian species during the bird breeding season, and the terrestrial biological report noted a specific potential for olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*), which is a California Species of Special Concern, to occur due to its breeding presence at nearby Samuel P. Taylor State Park and Kent Lake. While protective buffers are a common approach, recommended buffers are typically 250 feet for songbirds and 500 feet for raptors, and the size of the property would make the implementation of such buffers impractical. Additionally, the likelihood of multiple and/or successive nests on the site is low, so delayed construction should be a one-time delay. Mitigation Measure 8.A.2 below would

prevent adverse impacts to nesting birds by timing the construction appropriately and reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

### ***Mammals***

Special-status species of mammals reported from similar habitats in the region are the Point Reyes mountain beaver, pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*), silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*), and hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereous*). The Point Reyes mountain beaver is historically reported from San Geronimo Stream, but signs of continued presence were not identified during 1981 surveys. The onsite unnamed tributary does not provide suitable habitat for Point Reyes mountain beaver due to its denuded riparian cover, its relatively arid character compared to the humid and densely vegetated streams typically inhabited by the species, and the absence of sword ferns (*Polystichum munitum*) favored as a food item.

The property does not provide suitable habitat for bats due to the absence of trees, and the decayed residence which lacks a roof structure— therefore lacking the thermal conditions favored by roosting bats. The shed and two other outbuildings on the property are small and relatively low to the ground (i.e., less than 6 feet in height), but could potentially provide habitat for bats. These were inspected by Marin County employees, and no sign was detected. Changes to the shed and other outbuildings are not proposed as part of the project. There would be no impact to special-status mammals.

The biological report identified the nearest occurrence of California red-legged frog as 0.6 mile southwest from the proposed project in Lagunitas Creek, near the base of Peter's Dam below Kent Lake. The report concluded that the absence of suitable aquatic habitat within and adjacent to the proposed project strongly suggests that red-legged frogs are not present and are unlikely to disperse through the site. The property does not provide aquatic breeding habitat or summer aquatic refugia for red-legged frogs, and they are unlikely to disperse through the property. This conclusion is strengthened by an additional discussion of the distribution of known occurrences in Marin County and the specific notation that the closest occurrence was an observation of a single adult in non-breeding aquatic habitat.

### ***Red-legged Frogs***

Red-legged frogs are not dependent on year-round water and make seasonal movements through upland habitats without regard for terrain at distances up to 2 miles from breeding locations. Drainage networks between and among watersheds, including ephemeral tributaries during the dry season, are also thought to provide favored movement corridors presumably due to the riparian cover, leaf litter, high relative humidity, and terrestrial invertebrate prey items found in these areas. Though denuded of trees and ephemeral vegetation, the onsite unnamed tributary supports the growth of scattered ferns, horsetail (*Equisetum* sp.), and watercress (*Nasturtium officinal*), and would provide suitable non-aquatic refugia and movement habitat for the red-legged frog; additionally, the project site is within the species' 1.3-mile dispersal distance. However, a review of the distribution of 148 reported occurrences in Marin County shows that the Kent Lake or Peter's Dam occurrence is the easternmost record within a 13-mile radius (relative to the slight northwest to southeast orientation of the coastal ranges); all other occurrences within the 13-mile radius are west of Lagunitas

and concentrated in the Olema Valley and Point Reyes National Seashore. The nearest documented breeding location is three miles to the west. These facts, considered together with the property's location within an established residential neighborhood, support the conclusion that red-legged frog is unlikely to be encountered on the project site. There would be no impact to red-legged frogs.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

### **Mitigation Measure 8.A.1**

The applicant shall eliminate the replacement footbridge from the plans and reroute the ground-level utility lines to the southern bridge crossing. The applicant shall install the planting and vegetation management plan and shall supplement the planting within the banks of stream channel with willow (*Salix* sp.) and blackberry (*Rubus* sp.) to the extent feasible from the edge of the existing riparian vegetation upstream to the edge of the proposed culvert for the driveway.

### **Monitoring Measure 8.A.1**

Before issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit revised plans, including a revised planting and vegetation management plan, showing the project as modified by mitigation measure 8.A.2 to the Community Development Agency for review and approval. The revised plans shall specify when the work within the stream channel is to occur. Building Permit and landscaping inspections carried out by the Community Development Agency and the Department of Public Works shall verify that the plans are being implemented correctly and according to schedule.

Before Final Inspection, Community Development Agency staff shall inspect the site to ensure that the planting and vegetation management plan has been properly installed.

### **Mitigation Measure 8.A.2**

Avoid impacts to nesting birds. The breeding season for birds varies geographically but is typically interpreted in this region as the period between February 15 and August 31. Avoiding construction activities during the breeding season is the preferred strategy (but may conflict with seasonal avoidance of aquatic systems and Construction Best Management Practices that recommend dry-season construction). If seasonal avoidance cannot be implemented, a professional biologist shall survey the property for the presence of nesting birds and submit a report to the County planner. If nesting birds are identified, construction activities shall be delayed until the young have fledged.

### **Monitoring Measure 8.A.2**

Before issuance of a building permit, Community Development Agency staff shall verify that the applicant is avoiding nesting season or has submitted a report from a biologist verifying that nesting birds would not be adversely affected by the construction.



<b>b) Substantial change in the diversity, number, or habitat of any species of plants or animals currently present or likely to occur at any time throughout the year?</b> (source #(s) 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, 22, 23)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]	[ ]

The project would not substantially change the diversity, number, or habitat of any species of plants or animals currently or seasonally present because post-project conditions would be similar to pre-project conditions. The site would continue to be used for residential purposes, and the hardscape footprint would be only slightly enlarged. The site is already relatively cleared of trees and no additional trees would be removed. The fisheries and terrestrial biological reports prepared by WRA did not identify any special-status plant or animal species on the property.

The existing site is characterized as disturbed ground supporting non-native weedy vegetation. Native vegetation on the site is limited to a small patch of willow (*Salix* sp.) and blackberry (*Rubus* sp.) associated with downstream portions of an unnamed tributary, and to vegetation within the tributary channel. The degraded nature of the site suggests low diversity, and site use by animals is likely limited to feral cats, common wildlife, and nesting birds during the breeding season (approximately February 15 through August 31). Many wildlife species are nocturnal and regularly move through residential areas with sufficient cover, such as the Lagunitas Road neighborhood. Common wildlife and nesting birds would likely avoid the area during construction but return post-construction. Mitigation Measures 8.A.1 and 8.A.2 would address impacts to birds and riparian habitats. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>c) Introduction of new species of plants or animals into an area, or improvements or alterations that would result in a barrier to the migration, dispersal or movement of animals?</b> (source #(s): 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, 22, 23)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]	[ ]

The proposed project is not likely to result in the introduction of new species of plants into the area. Activities associated with demolition and construction of the new residence would be limited to central portions of the property, which are already disturbed and support non-native weedy vegetation.

Activities associated with replacing the two bridges across the unnamed tributary do have the potential to affect native vegetation, but this potential impact would be countered by restoring appropriate riparian vegetation along the channel, as specified in mitigation measure 8.A.1. With implementation of riparian planting as specified in

the revised planting and vegetation management plan, this potential impact would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not result in the introduction of new species of animals into the area or result in a barrier to animal movement. The site is located within an existing developed residential neighborhood and was the site of a pre-existing residence. Thus, domesticated pets such as cats and dogs have long been associated with both the project site and the surrounding neighborhood. While vacant properties are often used as refuge areas by feral animals and wildlife species, construction and inhabitation of the new residence, along with a slightly enlarged development footprint, would not serve as a significant barrier to the dispersal, migration or movement of animal species. The openness of the neighborhood to wildlife movement would remain the same. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**9. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal result in:***

<b>a) Substantial increase in demand for existing energy sources, or conflict with adopted policies or standards for energy use? (source #(s): 1, 6)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project involves the replacement of a pre-existing residence with a new residence. The project would be required to meet the minimum requirements of the Marin County Green Building Submittal Checklist, California Title 24 and Ordinance 3492. The Green Building Requirements include energy efficiency standards that would reduce energy consumption by the proposed project. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>b) Use of non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (source #(s): 1, 6)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The proposed project would be required to meet the requirements of the Marin County Green Building Submittal Checklist, California Title 24 and Ordinance 3492 to reduce the amount of energy consumed. Further, the construction of the proposed project involves a relatively small residential structure on a 17,890 square foot lot. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

c) <b>Loss of significant mineral resource sites designated in the Countywide Plan from premature development or other land uses which are incompatible with mineral extraction?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6, 20)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The proposed project involves the replacement of a pre-existing residence with a new residence. The project site is designated by the Marin CWP and zoned for single family residential development. Further, the proposed project is not located in an area that is designated by the State or the County as a significant mineral resource or mineral resource preservation area. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**10. HAZARDS. *Would the proposal involve:***

a) <b>A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) oil, pesticides; 2) chemicals; or 3) radiation)?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

No major or unusual quantities of explosive or hazardous materials would be present on the project site or during construction. The proposed project would be subject to the numerous federal, State, and local laws and regulations governing hazardous materials. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

b) <b>Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The proposed project would not interfere with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. The proposed project involves the replacement of a pre-existing residence, which is accessed via a private road off of Lagunitas Road. The proposed project would not include any work within public roadways, and access for emergency vehicles would not be obstructed. Further, emergency responders would not be hindered as the proposed project would be required to comply with existing building and fire codes. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

c) <b>The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
--	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The proposed project would include construction activities that employ hazards or the use of hazardous chemicals, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, oils and lubricants, paints and thinners, solvents, and other chemicals. Numerous federal, State, and local laws and regulations ensure the safe transportation, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. The applicant and contractors would be required to comply with all hazardous materials laws and regulations for the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

d) <b>Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6, 24)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
--	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The project site is not included on any of the environmental databases maintained by the State Water Resources Control Board or the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. It is unlikely that the proposed project would expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

e) <b>Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6, 25)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
--	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The project setting amid mature trees, bushes, and grasslands is conducive to the ignition and spread of a wildland fire if appropriate measures are not taken during construction activities. Further, the proposed project received 4 points on the Hazards Assessment Matrix of the Vegetative Fuels Management Plan and the area is generally classified as having a "high" fire risk by the County of Marin, which could expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. However, the project would be required to be designed and constructed in conformance with the standards of the Marin County Fire Department regarding defensible space and fire resistant building materials, and in conformance with applicable Building Code requirements. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**11. NOISE. *Would the proposal result in:***

<b>a) Substantial increases in existing ambient noise levels? (source #(s): 1)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project would result in the periodic generation of noise associated with construction activities, which would only occur for a temporary period and of limited duration. Vehicles traveling to and from the site would result in the generation of intermittent low levels of noise. All construction activity would be regulated through the County’s Noise Ordinance controlling permitted hours of activity and permitted noise levels. As the project entails the replacement of a pre-existing single-family residence, no new permanent sources of noise would be introduced. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>b) Exposure of people to significant noise levels, or conflicts with adopted noise policies or standards? (source #(s): 1)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

As discussed above in section 11a of this Initial Study, the proposed project would not expose the population in the area to significant noise levels. The noise generated from this project would be periodic and temporary in nature and would occur during certain hours of the day and week in preparation of the site and construction of the new residence. No additional noise would occur after this has been completed. As noted above, in section 11a, all construction activity would be regulated through the County’s Noise Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not conflict with adopted noise policies or standards. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**12. PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government service in any of the following areas:***

<b>a) Fire protection? (source #(s): 1, 28)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

Fire protection throughout much of unincorporated and rural Marin County is provided by the Marin County Fire Department. The project site is served by the Woodacre Fire Station; located approximately 4 miles from the project site. The proposed project

would not result an increased need for new fire protection services since the primary fire protection for Lagunitas is carried out by the Woodacre Fire Station and the potential for the replacement of a pre-existing residence would not result in a significance increase in service needs. Further, construction activities would be short-term and would involve a limited workforce. Project construction would not significantly increase demand on such facilities. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>b) Police protection? (source #(s): 1, 29)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project site is served by the Marin County Sheriff's Patrol Division, which provides police patrol services to unincorporated areas within the County. The Kentfield Substation, located at 1004 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard serves the community of Woodacre as well as the project site. The proposed project and construction of the proposed project would not be expected to significantly affect the Marin County Sheriff's ability to maintain service ratios, response times, other performance objectives, and new or physically altered facilities would not be required. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>c) Schools? (source #(s): 1, 27)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The Lagunitas School District provides public education to the areas of Forest Knolls, Lagunitas, San Geronimo, and Woodacre. The proposed project would not result in the increased need for new schools since the replacement of a pre-existing single-family residence would not result in an increase in service needs. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (source #(s): 1, 6, 8)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project would not result in the increased need for or maintenance of public facilities or roads since the proposed project is replacing a pre-existing residence. Further, because the construction activities would be short-term and would involve a limited workforce, project construction would not significantly increase the demand on such facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on public facilities.

e) <b>Other governmental services?</b> (source #(s): 1, 6)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project would not impact other government services such as parks or libraries since the replacement of a pre-existing residence would not increase the population that needs such services. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**13. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:***

a) <b>Power or natural gas?</b> (source #(s): 1, 8)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the environment due to an increased need for new power and natural gas services since the project site is currently being served by Pacific Gas and Electric Company and a private propane service company. In addition, the new residence could be served by extending service from the existing power pole servicing the property and the residence could be plumbed for propane during construction. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

b) <b>Communications systems?</b> (source #(s): 1, 8)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project would not result in significant impacts due to an increased need for communications systems since service is available from various telephone and cable companies. Further, communications systems from the pre-existing residence would be replaced with those associated with the proposed residence. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (source #(s): 1)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
--	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The project would not increase need for water treatment or distribution facilities since the property is served by the Marin Municipal Water District. The water district has indicated that they already serve the property. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>d) Sewer or septic tanks? (source #(s): 1)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
---	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The project would not result in significant impacts to the environment due to an increased need for septic services. The proposed project includes a new septic system that has already been preliminarily reviewed by the Marin County Environmental Health Services, and will need final EHS approval prior to issuance of a building permit. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>e) Storm water drainage? (source #(s): 1, 8)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
---	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The project would not result in significant impacts to storm water drainage facilities since it would not result in additional stormwater being deposited into any public storm drains. Further, the proposed project would be subject to review and approval by Marin County DPW to ensure that construction complies with Marin County Code, Title 24 (Development Standards) for drainage and erosion control. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<b>f) Solid waste disposal? (source #(s): 1, 30)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
--	---------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]
-----	-----	-------	-----

The proposed project would not create a significant increase in solid waste production, and existing solid waste collection services are adequate. Waste collected from the project site would be taken to the Redwood Landfill, located in Novato. The Redwood Landfill is permitted to receive 2,300 tons of waste per day; it has a remaining



capacity of approximately 12,900,000 cubic yards and is expected to reach its permitted capacity in 2039. The proposed project would not exceed the landfill's permitted daily tonnage or depleting substantial long-term capacity. The proposed project would also comply with the applicable local, state, and federal regulations concerning solid waste. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**14. AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:***

<p><b>a) Substantially reduce, obstruct, or degrade a scenic vista open to the public or scenic highway, or conflict with adopted aesthetic or visual policies or standards? (source #(s): 1, 6, 7)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The project would not result in significant impacts to a scenic vistas and open space lands or conflict with visual policies. The proposed project would not reduce, obstruct or degrade unique natural site amenities including hillsides, watercourse, stands of significant trees, or other natural features that are distinguishing characteristics of the surrounding area. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<p><b>b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect by causing a substantial alteration of the existing visual resources including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) an abrupt transition in land use; 2) disharmony with adjacent uses because of height, bulk or massing of structures; or 3) cast of a substantial amount of light, glare, or shadow? (source #(s):1, 6, 7)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to the aesthetic effects resulting from substantial alteration of existing visual resources since the proposed project would replace a pre-existing residence with a new residence in approximately the same location. Design Review would ensure that it is in keeping with the Single-family Residential Design Guidelines and the requirements of the zoning district regarding height, size and location, and would be required to meet the Design Guidelines of the San Geronimo Valley Community Plan. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**15. CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

*Would the proposal:*

<p><b>a) Disturb paleontological, archaeological, or historical sites, objects, or structures? (source #(s): 1, 6, 7, 31)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>
	<p>[ ]</p>	<p>[ ]</p>	<p>[ X ]</p>	<p>[ ]</p>

There is no evidence that the project would disturb paleontological resources and there are no historic structures on the site that would be affected by the project. A review of cultural resource maps maintained by the Marin County Community Development Agency indicates that the subject property is not located in a mapped area of sensitivity. No human remains or archeological resources of any kind are known to be on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the future development of the project on the subject property would not require significant grading or disturb a large land area. Lastly, in case any archaeologically significant resources are encountered during excavation work, a uniformly applied standard requires the applicant to cease all construction activity. This is done in order to consult with County staff and to hire a registered archaeologist to examine the site and provide an analysis. If necessary, this is done in order to properly assess the find and to undertake the proper steps before construction is allowed to resume.

Further, although the original structure appears to have been built in 1925, only small portion (approximately 265 square feet) remains of the original 870 square foot residence, and the remaining structure is down to the framing and is in very poor condition. Therefore, the structure is not intact enough to have any potential historical significance.

The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

<p><b>b) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would adversely affect unique ethnic cultural values, or religious or sacred uses within the project area? (source #(s): 1, 6, 7, 31)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>
	<p>[ ]</p>	<p>[ ]</p>	<p>[ X ]</p>	<p>[ ]</p>

Neither staff site visits nor review of the Marin County CDA resource maps indicate the presence of unique ethnic, cultural values, or religious or sacred uses within the project area. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**16. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS. *Would the proposal result in:***

<p><b>Any physical changes which can be traced through a chain of cause and effect to social or economic impacts. (source #(s): 1)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ X ]</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>
--	---	---	---	---

The proposed project would not result in any physical change that would result in a negative social or economic effect because it would replace a pre-existing residence. The proposed project would not result in a significant increase in the costs of providing limited County services to the project area nor would it result in adverse physical effects on the environment. The project would not result in a significant impact related to this issue.

**V. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.** Pursuant to Section 15065 of the State EIR Guidelines, a project shall be found to have a significant effect on the environment if any of the following are true:

- |   |            |           |              |
|---|------------|-----------|--------------|
|   | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Maybe</b> |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | [ ]        | [ X ]     | [ ]          |

*As described in Section IV of this Initial Study, any potential environmental impacts from the proposed project would be mitigated to a level of insignificance.*

- |  |            |           |              |
|--|------------|-----------|--------------|
|  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Maybe</b> |
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? | [ ]        | [ X ]     | [ ]          |

*As described in Section IV of this Initial Study, any potential environmental impacts from the proposed project would be mitigated to a level of insignificance.*

- |  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Maybe</b> |
|--|------------|-----------|--------------|
| c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects). | [ ]        | [X]       | [ ]          |

*As described in Section IV of this Initial Study, any potential environmental impacts from the proposed project would be mitigated to a level of insignificance.*

- |   | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Maybe</b> |
|---|------------|-----------|--------------|
| d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | [ ]        | [X]       | [ ]          |

*As described in Section IV of this Initial Study, any potential environmental impacts from the proposed project would be mitigated to a level of insignificance.*

**VI. PROJECT SPONSOR'S INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES:**

Acting on behalf of the project sponsor or the authorized agent of the project sponsor, I (undersigned) have reviewed the Initial Study for the Saban Variance and Design Review and have particularly reviewed the mitigation measures and monitoring programs identified herein. I accept the findings of the Initial Study, including the recommended mitigation measures, and hereby agree to modify the proposed project applications now on file with Marin County to include and incorporate all mitigation measures and monitoring programs set out in this Initial Study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*(Project Sponsor's Name or Representative)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
*(Project Sponsor's Name or Representative)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**VII. DETERMINATION:** (Completed by Marin County Planning Manager). Pursuant to Sections 15081 and 15070 of the State Guidelines, the forgoing Initial Study evaluation, and the entire administrative record for the project:

I find that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeremy Tejirian, Planning Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **SABAN VARIANCE AND DESIGN REVIEW DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE**

The following is a list of relevant information sources that have been incorporated by reference into the foregoing Initial Study pursuant to Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The number assigned to each information source corresponds to the number listed in parenthesis following the incorporating topical question of the Initial Study checklist. These documents are both a matter of public record and available for public inspection either online or at the Planning Division office of the Marin County Community Development Agency (CDA), Suite 308, 3501 Civic Center Drive, San Rafael. The information incorporated from these documents shall be considered to be set forth fully in the Initial Study.

1. Saban Variance and Design Review plans, including civil engineering plans, architectural plans, erosion control plans, septic plans, and landscaping plans, received July 12, 2012.
2. Friar Associates, Inc., 2011. Geotechnical Investigation New Residential Building 100 Lagunitas, California, June 2011.
3. WRA. 2012. Letter from WRA Fisheries Biologist Daniel Chase to William Clark, P.E. regarding potential impacts on fisheries habitat resulting from the project located at 100 Lagunitas Road. Letter dated April 27, 2012.
4. WRA. 2011. 100 Lagunitas Road Biological Resources Assessment Report, Lagunitas, Marin County, California. Prepared for Israel Saban. September 9, 2011.
5. Saunders Design, 2011. Vegetative Fuels Management Plan and Hazards Assessment Matrix for Property at 100 Lagunitas Road, Lagunitas, CA 94938.
6. Marin Countywide Plan, CDA - Planning Division (1994 and 2007)
7. Marin County Development Code, Title 22, CDA - Planning Division
8. Marin County Development Standards, Title 24, Marin County Department of Public Works - Land Use & Water Resources Division
9. Soil Survey of Marin County, USDA Soil Conservation Service (1985)
10. Flood Insurance Rate Map Series of Marin County, California, prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency
11. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), 2013. Marin County Earthquake Hazard Map. Available online:  
<http://gis.abag.ca.gov/website/liquefactionsusceptibility/index.html>
12. California Department of Conservation, (CDC), 2014. Marin County Tsunami Inundation Maps, available online:  
[http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geologic\\_hazards/Tsunami/Inundation\\_Maps/Marin/Pages/Marin.aspx](http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geologic_hazards/Tsunami/Inundation_Maps/Marin/Pages/Marin.aspx), accessed March 31, 2014.
13. Alquist –Priolo Special Studies Zone Map (1974)
14. Hydrology Study, Saban Residence, William Clark, PE, May 22, 2012
15. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), 2009. Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance, October, 2009.

16. BAAQMD, 2010. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2010.
17. BAAQMD, 2012. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2012.
18. BAAQMD, 2014. Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status, obtained on-line ([http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air\\_quality/ambient\\_air\\_quality.htm](http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm)) April 8, 2014.
19. Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2003. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines: The Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. August, 2003.
20. Mineral Resources, CDA - Planning Division (1987)
21. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2014. Rarefind v. 5. Online version of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB).
22. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2006. Estimating the Effects of Auditory and Visual Disturbance to Northern Spotted Owls and Marbled Murrelets in Northwestern California. July 26, 2006.
23. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2002. Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*). Region 1, Portland Oregon. May 28, 2002.
24. California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), 2014. EnviroStor database. Available online: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
25. County of Marin, 2014. Marin Map, Hazard, Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Available online:  
<http://www.marinmap.org/Geocortex/Essentials/Marinmap/Web/Viewer.aspx?Site=MMDataViewer>.
26. State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), 2014. GeoTracker database. Available online: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>
27. Lagunitas School District, official website, available online at <http://lagunitas.marin.k12.ca.us/default.htm>, accessed October 22, 2013.
28. Marin County Fire Department, Woodacre Fire Station, available online at <http://www.marincounty.org/depts/fr/divisions/operations/stations/woodacre>, accessed March 18, 2014.
29. Marin County Sheriff Department, official website, available online at <http://www.marinsheriff.org/>, accessed March 19, 2014.
30. CalRecycle, Facility/Site Summary Details: Redwood Sanitary Landfill (21-AA-0001), available online at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/21-AA-0001/Detail/>, accessed December 2, 2013.
31. Marin County Archaeological Sites Inventory Map, CDA - Planning Division (undated) *confidential*.